

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were pending as of the action mailed on November 26, 2008. Claims 1, 16, and 26 are in independent form.

Claims 1, 26, and 30 are being amended for clarity. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, for example, on page 15, lines 7-17. Claims 16-25 are cancelled.

Reconsideration of the action is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The examiner rejected claims 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,423,041 ("Burke") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0043965 ("Heller").

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1-15 and 26-30 were rejected as being indefinite. In particular, the examiner states that the relationships between the first attribute node, the first attribute, the first condition node, and the conditional expression are unclear. The applicant respectfully disagrees. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the applicant has amended claims 1, 26, and 30 for clarity. In particular, the claims now recite that "a first attribute node points to a first condition node when a first attribute associated with the first attribute node is used in a conditional expression associated with the first condition node." The applicant respectfully requests that the section 112 objection be withdrawn and that claims 1-15 and 26-30 be allowed.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 16-25

Claims 16-25 were rejected over Burke and Heller. While the applicant does not acquiesce to the correctness of the rejection, in order to expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, these claims have been cancelled.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any credits or charges to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2009

/Brian J. Gustafson/
Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 26181
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071